

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

Vol. V, No. 3

March 5, 1945

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## The Conference of the "Big Three"

THE conference of the "Big Three," meeting in secret in the Crimea, has had the hopes and fears of the world centered upon it for some weeks. The fears were prompted by the obvious deterioration in the relations of the great powers to each other in recent months, occasioned by the many unsolved problems between them.

The results of the conference have lifted the hopes of the world and allayed many of its apprehensions. It would be unwise to hail the agreements reached with a too uncritical enthusiasm. Many of the agreements have not yet been spelled out; and they may not be as creative when they are implemented as they appear when clothed only in general terms. Nevertheless a genuine advance in mutual accord between the great powers must be recorded with gratitude.

To the highest achievements of the conference belongs its decision to call a meeting of the United Nations. This means not only that the accord between the great powers is sufficient to be subjected to the strains of a larger conference; but also that a beginning will be made in broadening the basis of a world wide partnership and in giving it some constitutional form.

Military necessity may dictate "big three" conferences, but ultimately three men cannot adequately represent three great nations, and three great nations cannot preside over the destinies of the world. Some idealistic critics have found the very idea of such a conference repulsive, because they detected the perils of "super-imperialism" in a conference in which a few powerful nations presumed to decide how the smaller nations of Europe should reorganize their life. There is indeed the peril of injustice in the organization of the world by unified preponderant power. But if the great powers had not reached an agreement we would have faced such a monstrous peril of world anarchy, that we could not have worried about justice or injustice. Order must come first. Let considerations of justice however be an almost simultaneous second. Technical warfare has undoubtedly made great nations too powerful and weak nations too weak from the standpoint of justice. But this situation which a techni-

cal civilization has created may make toward world unity if the nations, which possess the strategic power, can achieve the core of unity by their agreement. The Crimean Conference has strengthened that core and the decision to hold a United Nations meeting holds out the promise that the authority of a world-wide partnership will be broadened.

The second great achievement of the conference lies in its mutual settlement of specific disputes, upon which various nations threatened to take unilateral action. It is certainly a gain that the reorganization of the Polish government is to be undertaken under the supervision of a committee upon which all three powers are represented. On these and other specific issues obvious concessions have been made to Russia; but Russia has had to concede the right of the other nations to a voice in the decision.

The primary hazard to our future peace undoubtedly lies in the relation of the Western powers to Russia. Any accord with Russia undoubtedly contains some peril of the possible domination of the continent by Russia. The lack of an accord involves the greater peril of an ultimate conflict with her. If some mutual accord with Russia can be maintained, even the first peril can be avoided if the West supports the democratic center in the governments of the continent and thus refrains from giving Russia the advantage of organizing resistance to discredited monarchies.

On the problem of Germany the conference achieved some gains, primarily in making a distinction between the Nazis and the militarists and the German people, despite the propaganda against this distinction. The German people are promised the right to live, though it must be admitted that the promise is not accompanied by any specific assurances. The demand for reparations may contain the seeds of a vast servitude. It is rather difficult to see how a nation which will be economically, politically and spiritually as bankrupt as Germany can pay reparations without becoming a slave nation. The demand of "the elimination and control of all German industry which could be used for war production" contains the difficulty analyzed by the

Brookings Institute report on that subject. All industry is potentially war industry as our own total mobilization for war has proved. This demand may therefore contain the dangerous idea of de-industrialization to the point where it would increase the economic chaos in which a defeated nation is bound to find itself. Nevertheless the crime which Germany has committed against the world community has been so great, that it is inevitable that some unwise, as well as wise, measures will be taken to try to avert a recrudescence of German militarism.

On the whole, the best chance of avoiding purely punitive measures against a fallen foe lie in an accord between the victors, which will prevent them from hiding their fear of each other behind their fear of the foe. In this respect the general accord of the conference may well tend to operate against perilous tendencies in some of its detailed commitments.

"If hopes are dupes, fears may be liars" declares the poet. We are not yet in a situation in which we may not be duped by our hopes. But some of our fears have already proved to be liars. We have more justification for moderate hopes than we have had in years.

R. N.

## Editorial Notes

*The Christian Century* has caused serious misunderstanding of the Cleveland Conference. According to its interpretation of the findings of the Conference, support of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals was given on condition that the nine amendments to those proposals recommended by the Conference are adopted. This is tantamount to an outright rejection of Dumbarton Oaks. Some improvements along the lines of several of the amendments are possible when the United Nations meet at San Francisco, because of pressure from the small nations and because of criticism by public opinion within Britain and America. But it is hardly to be expected that the plan on which the nations finally agree will embody all the amendments. The Cleveland Conference must not be used to scuttle Dumbarton Oaks.

Both the debate at the first plenary session and the vote on the resolution in support of Dumbarton Oaks at that time made it evident that a large majority did not regard the amendments as conditions. Because of a minority which thought that debate had been cut short at that first session, the Conference committee re-opened the matter the next morning and the following words were adopted: "Accordingly, we recommend that the churches support the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as an important step in the direction of world cooperation, but because we do not approve of them in their entirety

as they now stand we urge the following measures for their improvement." Those words on which *The Christian Century* bases its interpretation do not suggest that support is conditional on the adoption of the proposed measures. It is not inconsistent to support that which we do not approve in its entirety when the only available alternative is something worse. How often do we have the privilege of supporting that which we approve in its entirety? Moreover, those words were adopted with no serious opposition. They were accepted by the members of the Conference who had stood strongly for support of Dumbarton Oaks with or without the amendments. If it had been hinted that they meant what *The Christian Century* now reads into them, they would have been repudiated by a large majority, if previous debates and votes on relevant issues are any indication of the mind of the Conference.

*The Christian Century* has one verbal argument on its side. It is true that Dumbarton Oaks was not accepted unconditionally in the sense that whatever plan grows out of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at the next meeting of the United Nations would be supported even though it proves to be less desirable than the proposals before us. But it misrepresents Cleveland to move from rejection of unconditional support in that sense to the claim that the nine amendments were regarded as conditions on which support depended.

It is true that the churches can only give any such institution their *critical* support. To allow their criticisms to encourage defeat of treaty ratification in the Senate is to repeat tragic history.



One of the ablest and most honored of Negro churchmen, who recently lost his son on the Italian front, wrote to his friends that he hoped that his son had not died in vain, and then, in his letter, he said that "the scorching, numbing pain" could never strip him of pride in one "whose earthly life was given up for a country and a world that tried to tear him and his fellows down with prejudice, proscription, segregation and shame." The author of those words is not given to personal bitterness. They are written out of a sense of solidarity with his race and so they reveal more clearly than most words of protest the depth of the wrong that has been done by the institutions and the attitudes of our whole society. Many of us who belong to the majority race have learned a great deal in recent years about the external facts of the race problem in America but here in a flash we see its inner meaning: the divided soul of a nation that is fighting for justice and the spiritual wounds that accompany the injustice that it inflicts.

J. C. B.

# Crucial Issues in the Japanese Evacuation

GALEN M. FISHER

ASKED to discuss the prospects for reincorporating the evacuees into normal American life, I shall devote my limited space to certain factors and issues, taking up first, the most fundamental issue.

*Due Process.* As if to make assurance doubly sure, the Constitution twice guarantees "any person" against being "deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law." The Fifth Amendment puts it in general terms, the Fourteenth, in reference to State action. It is noteworthy that "person," not "citizen" is used in both instances, thus embracing aliens also under the aegis of due process.

The basic faults in the procedure followed by the Commander of the Western Defense Command, General DeWitt, were denial of any form of due process to the evacuees, and making race the basis of exclusion. This assertion rests upon no less authority than Justice Frank Murphy, who, in his dissenting opinion of December 18, 1944, in the *Korematsu Case*, declared in his first sentence: "This exclusion of 'all persons of Japanese ancestry, both alien and non-alien,' from the Pacific Coast area on a plea of military necessity, in the absence of martial law, ought not to be approved. Such exclusion goes over 'the very brink of constitutional power' and falls into the ugly abyss of racism."

General DeWitt received authority to exclude persons from his Command area on February 20, 1942, and during the succeeding month, he was deliberating on procedure. Finally, on March 21, he cast the die for indiscriminate mass evacuation. This decision came as a shock to many thoughtful citizens, who had taken it for granted that the pleas for selective evacuation made by Attorney General Biddle as early as December 10, 1941, and later by Coast educators, church leaders, social workers and business men, would unquestionably be heeded. The Tolan Congressional Committee itself, after making extensive inquiries which ended on March 12, suggested that hearings should be held at the Assembly Centers to separate the loyal from the disloyal.

The most explicit appeals for selective evacuation by means of hearing boards were made by religious leaders on March 1 and by civic leaders on March 9, 1942. The religious leaders were five men closely connected with Japanese Christian work. They offered to provide eighty church buildings and 330 interpreters for the hearings. The civic leaders were appointed by Henry F. Grady, then Chairman of the Committee on National Security (later changed to American Principles) and Fair Play and included Provost Monroe Deutsch, University of California, Pres. Robert Sproul being detained at the last moment; Alfred Lundberg, Pres. State C.

of Commerce; Chester Rowell; Maurice Harrison and Jesse Steinhart, noted lawyers, and the writer. They had sent the General a memorandum in advance of the interview with his representative, in which they had suggested using the Selective Service Boards as hearing boards to examine at least the *nisei*.

On December 18, 1944, the Supreme Court validated the evacuation by a six to three vote, the majority declining to go behind the assertion of the Army Commander that national security justified the procedure adopted by him. But the dissenting justices, Murphy, Roberts, and Jackson, subjected the evidence adduced by General DeWitt to devastating scrutiny. Justice Murphy's dissent is so convincing that it may well become the majority ruling of the Court in some future case when the present ruling, like so many other unsound precedents, shall be reversed. Quotation of a few sections must suffice.

"In excommunicating them without benefit of hearings, this order also deprives them of all their constitutional rights to procedural due process. Yet no reasonable relation to an 'immediate, imminent, and impending' public danger is evident to support this racial restriction, which is one of the most sweeping and complete deprivations of constitutional rights in the history of this nation, in the absence of martial law.

"No adequate reason is given for the failure to treat these Japanese-Americans on an individual basis by holding investigations and hearings to separate the loyal from the disloyal, as was done in the case of persons of German and Italian ancestry. It is asserted (in General DeWitt's FINAL REPORT) merely that the loyalties of this group 'were unknown and time was of the essence.' Yet nearly four months elapsed after Pearl Harbor before the first exclusion order was issued; nearly eight months went by until the last order was issued; and the last of these 'subversive' persons was not actually removed until almost eleven months had elapsed. Leisure and deliberation seem to have been more of the essence than speed. And the fact that conditions were not such as to warrant a declaration of martial law adds strength to the belief that the factors of time and military necessity were not as urgent as they have been represented to be." Justice Murphy, in his dissenting opinion, suggested that it seemed incredible the hearings could not have been held, particularly since only 112,000 persons and only 70,000 American citizens were involved, many of whom were old people and children.

*Detention for the Duration.* The fact that the



army had summarily evacuated all persons of Japanese ancestry made it natural for the thoughtless white citizens on the Coast to assume that they all must be disloyal. *Ergo*, they should be "treated rough," and on no account released from the Centers until after the war. Even prominent lawyers, who happened also to be politicians, echoed this sentiment. The War Relocation Authority lawyers said privately that detention was probably illegal, being justifiable only on humanitarian grounds. The race-baiters never tired of denouncing the W.R.A. for "coddling" the evacuees, when in equity, and in law, as well, the Government owed the evacuees far better treatment than it gave.

I have said "in law, as well," because on December 18, 1944, the Supreme Court tossed a bomb into the camp of the denouncers of the W.R.A. by ruling unanimously that no loyal citizen of Japanese ancestry could be detained against his will. Then Justice Murphy again pushed the logic of the ruling to its obvious end by declaring that "detention . . . regardless of loyalty, is not only unauthorized by Congress or the Executive, but is another example of the unconstitutional resort to racism inherent in the whole evacuation program."

*How Determine Loyalty?* Immediately after Pearl Harbor, about 8,000 enemy aliens on the West Coast were seized by the F.B.I. The great majority were interned, but only after each of them had been given a hearing. Among them were about 3,000 Japanese. Hearing board lawyers told me that they found little, if any, more difficulty in determining whether or not the Japanese were loyal than they found in the case of the Germans and Italians; that the same rules of evidence applied to all.

Blinded by prejudice or unscrupulous propaganda, the uncritical public has assumed that all of the 18,000 evacuees now detained at Tule Lake were disloyal. The abortive "registration" taken by the army and the W.R.A. in the Centers early in 1943, was a farce so far as affording sound grounds for determining loyalty goes. This was the conclusion reached by Professor Morris Opler, anthropologist, of Pomona College, after attending re-hearings and examining the evidence of some seventy evacuees classified as disloyal, on the basis of their registration answers.

It should, however, be made clear that there are several thousands of anti-American evacuees at Tule Lake, many of them kibe (sent to Japan as children for schooling) and the rest mostly aliens. They have shown their disloyalty by both word and deed. A considerable proportion of the elderly, however, want to be repatriated, not because they are anti-American, but because they have nothing to hope for here, but do have relatives or a homestead awaiting them in Japan. The 6,000 children, more or less, nearly all act like the Americans that they

are, and if dragged to Japan by their parents, will be victims of tragic circumstance.

It goes without saying that the loyalty of evacuees, as of every one else, is tested primarily by their conduct. And when it comes to conduct, two illuminating masses of evidence are available. The first is that supplied by Dr. Ernest Price's experience as an agent of the Department of Justice in interviewing some 600 evacuees. These 600 comprised those persons living in three of the Centers who had visited Japan within ten years before Pearl Harbor, the purpose being to glean from them information about military and industrial installations which would be useful to our attacking forces. Dr. Price states that "all but about five per cent proved to be ready to give all possible information that would enable us to defeat Japan. When one recalls the resentment felt by not a few of them over the evacuation, and adds to that the great danger of reprisal to which they exposed themselves, their action showed where their loyalty lay." \*

The second mass of evidence is none other than the heroism and fighting efficiency shown by the 13,000 nisei serving in our armed forces. Is it not ironical that hundreds of parents confined in Relocation Centers have received from the War Department notices that their boys in the famous 100th and 442nd Battalions had been killed or wounded? Small wonder that in face of such proof of loyalty by nisei to their America and ours, the race-baiters have piped down.

*Dispersion Eastward, or Return to the Coast?* One of the few compensations for the enormous sacrifices exacted by evacuation has been the resettler's thrill at being able to resettle in communities where they are free of discrimination, able to get congenial work, and welcome to join Caucasian organizations. In making all this possible, generous assistance has been given by church and social agencies, as well as by the W.R.A. Resettlers with Christian affiliations have found their path smoother than have the Buddhists, although Christian agencies have given scholarships and other aid to Buddhists as well as to Christians. All the leads in the resettlement process have stressed the importance of dispersion, so as to facilitate blending with the body social and to avoid reproducing the "little Tokyos" of the Coast. But although the resettlers theoretically have assented to this idea, in practice, common interests and problems and the lure of city jobs and attractions have combined to make a disproportionate number flock to certain cities. Much of the success of the policy of dispersion and integration hinges upon how actively the Caucasian churches and civic leaders make the newcomers feel at home.

\* See Dr. Price's fuller statement in article by me in *Christian Century*, Nov. 8, 1944.

But what of the 60,000 still in the Relocation Centers? The lifting of the West Coast ban by the army and the decision as to detention by the Supreme Court did not start a stampede from the Centers. The rate of resettlement has continued about the same as before, nor is it expected to increase before April. The reasons are many and complex. Among them are such as these. Thirty months of camp life, bare and abnormal though it is, has developed the institutional, dependent attitude. Many of the oldsters, after grubbing all their lives, have relished the unwonted leisure and ready-made subsistence. Too old to do heavy work again, and often with minor children to support, they cling to the security of the Centers. "Reservation" life has been debilitating for the evacuees, as it used to be for the Indians. A minority own farms or city homes on the Coast, but they can't take possession until after due notices, and some of them are loath to give up the rents, which mean a larger profit if they continue to get their living at the Centers. On the other hand, many of the evacuees are afraid to face the dangers of boycotting, intensified discrimination, and bodily harm, all of which have been loudly threatened—but thus far, seldom carried out—by persons with selfish interests to serve. They have lost their nerve—and no wonder, after being subjected for three years to suspicion, abuse, and dire threats. Besides, they all know that the only ways to be sure of a roof over their heads, in most parts of the country, is to own a house or take house-work, or buy a place, or be accepted for war industry. Lack of capital to start farming or merchandising again, the shortage of farm machinery, even if one has money to buy it, and the difficulty of qualifying for loans are all additional obstacles.

*Clearing away the Road-blocks.* The army has sole authority to give clearance for return to the Coast. Permits have already been issued to many evacuees, and hearings are now being held by army officers for others whose records are not perfectly clear. Unfortunately, in at least one Center, some hearings have been confined to yes and no answers, with no opportunity for the respondent to explain. For example, he is asked, "Have you ever been to Japan?" and if the reply is "Yes," regardless of the length of stay or for what purpose, he is likely to be given an "Excludee" card, that is, be debarred from the Coast. To be sure, he is told that he can appeal later to a hearing board, but he is likely to be deeply embittered, and to do all in his power to discourage resettlement.

Another road-block is the announcement by the W.R.A. that Center schools will function only through the spring term, and that all Centers will be closed by December 31. From the cold administrative viewpoint, that announcement was sound.

Longer confinement is bad for the evacuees, deprives the nation of manpower, costs the taxpayer more. But the evacuees are in a hot, not a cold, mood. They see giants in the way at every turn. They hold the rooted conviction that since Uncle Sam put them into their present fix, he should certainly go a good deal farther to get them out than simply to pay for transportation to their place of settlement, and give a per capita \$25.00 to prime the pump. Psychologically, it might have been shrewder if the W.R.A. had offered a bonus for early resettlement. But W.R.A. is financially dependent on Congress and the Director of the Budget. In face of the relentless opposition of most of the Western Congressmen and of many papers and broadcasters, it is nothing short of miraculous that W.R.A. has been able to give the evacuees such a measure of decent and democratic treatment. In equity, the Government ought to grant restitution to not a few of the impoverished evacuees, so that they could hold up their heads, instead of being reduced to dependency or a meager subsistence. But apparently, the only way to get such government action would be for a host of citizens to bring determined pressure upon Congress.

As to providing no schooling after the spring term, the likelihood that families with children will be among the last to be resettled argues strongly for retaining enough teachers to provide not only summer activities, but also regular classes in the fall.

No one denies that shortage of housing is a serious obstacle to rapid resettlement, but it may be exaggerated. At this writing, W.R.A. holds offers of jobs in Northern California alone for several hundred evacuees, with housing provided in practically every case, and often for families. At the Strategy Conference on evacuee and other racial problems, held by the Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play at San Francisco, on January 10 and 11, explicit assurance was given by the Federal Housing Authority (as by many other federal and state agencies) that they would not discriminate in housing or other facilities on account of race or color. But in both housing and farm loans, local government agencies often do practice such discrimination. I have been assured, however, that the highest officials are exerting themselves to overcome this obstacle, and that measurable success seems certain.

In conclusion, therefore, it appears to be clear that, despite all the difficulties and injustices that block the road, it is the part of wisdom, good sportsmanship, and fidelity to the nation in this time of crisis, for the evacuees in the Centers to forget their grievances and press hard toward resettlement; and for all friends of the evacuees to encourage and aid them in reaching that goal.

## Chaplains' Correspondence

We submit the following letters on various subjects from our chaplains dealing with the religious situations and reactions to political problems in the army.

Rev. H. Ingham, a volunteer British chaplain writes as follows about the denominational issue:

"Sir:

Eastbourne, England

"The November issue of C. & C. containing Mr. Gilkey's article has just come to hand and I am concerned with some of the implications. Surely the solution of the problem as set forth by Mr. Gilkey lies with the individual chaplain rather than with 'Protestantism.' If a Protestant Chaplain is more concerned with the teaching of his own particular faith, rather than the "faith once delivered to the saints" he has not grasped the opportunity given to him in the service of the chaplaincy.

"Few enlisted men care for our divisions—whether Protestant or Roman Catholic—many are concerned about 'faith' (see soldier's letter in same issue) and if chaplains recognize this and plan their work accordingly, they will find a ready response amongst all ranks.

"I am Minister of a Congregational Church in the South of England and an Officiating Chaplain of the United Board—no military standing, but recognized for service where a regular chaplain is not available. It has been my privilege to contact different groups of American servicemen and minister to their spiritual needs. I first approach the O.C. and offer my services and in every case they have been gladly accepted. I do not state to what church I belong—and have not been asked. One G.I. after attending my church asked me what a 'Congregational Church' was, as 'we do not have them back home.' I have ministered to all classes including Roman Catholics and Jews and found the same spiritual need amongst them all."

Chaplain George Edgar also deprecates the raising of denominational issues, particularly any subject of conflict between Protestant and Catholic Chaplains:

"As a Protestant Chaplain, Presbyterian, U.S.A., I wish to protest against the sentiment voiced in the letter from the un-named chaplain which appeared on the back page of your issue of December, 1944. I have served in a number of capacities as a chaplain; as a Base Chaplain in the States, as chaplain with a combat group, and now at this Headquarters, and I have never seen Protestant Chaplains abused in favor of the Roman Chaplains. In fact one thing stands out in the Chaplains Corps and that is the parity of treatment for all.

"No officer can discriminate against Protestant worship. If such a condition exists it is the fault of the chaplain discriminated against. He has the backing of Army Regulations, his immediate supervisory chaplain, and of the Chief's Office in Washington. If the officer in question will not co-operate, all the chaplain has to do is to put the matter on his monthly report and things will really happen.

"As a Protestant Chaplain I feel that I have all the backing I need. My own denomination is behind me, so is the Joint Commission on Army and Navy Chap-

lains, and so is the Chief's Office in Washington. What more can a man want? If any of us fail in getting what we are entitled to it is because we allow ourselves to be kicked around. Let's get over this persecution mania and bring out of this war a new understanding among men of all faiths."

Chaplain Robert Curry, who serves in a hospital in the Pacific theater, gives an interesting and somewhat disturbing picture of the reaction of the soldiers to the political issue:

"I have read and reread your article on cooperation with Russia in the post-war world. I find there is a general distrust among service men who are thinking about the aims of Russia, and I fail to see how without trust there is any possibility of cooperation with either an ally or an enemy.

"At present I am engaged in evening discussions with young men who are losing their idealism and getting very tangled up about what they are fighting for in the war. There is a growing feeling that English imperialism is rearing its head under Churchill and the present situation in Greece is most disturbing. As to what we are doing in the way of foreign policy we can gather nothing—and off here in the Islands we see little in the way of literature, and so I hope that *Christianity and Crisis* will help to fill the gap."

A chaplain who desires to remain anonymous, protests against the ideas expressed sometime ago in this paper that Christianity is not merely the approach of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. He writes:

"You don't give an answer to what a soldier is going to do 'about the contradiction between those ideals (Sermon on the Mount) and the tragic realities in which he finds himself involved.' You seem to indicate that ultimately we can accept murder as the basic evil which we must reject, but as the sinner who wanted to accept Christ, but could not get himself to give up his pet sin, said, 'Later but not now.' In other words, we are going to accept the Sermon on the Mount as our moral code, when we have no longer any need for it, but in this world of sin, greed, and strife we must be realists and reject the teachings of Jesus until it suits our convenience. I doubt whether we can harmonize the teachings of Jesus and killing, even in war. So the church has nothing to offer the soldier in a way of compromise. It can only give him comfort in that God is forgiving and that he must, even though a soldier, conduct himself as near like a Christian as possible.

"Our religious periodicals are not making a strong enough appeal to our own people to repent. They fail to show our guilt in the war. We are too Pharisaical. Even now you can see the strings pulled by different nations for control of the world's goods. The things of which we accuse Hitler or Mussolini or Japan we are guilty of ourselves—at least fundamentally. Those Christian leaders who support war on the basis of realism are not realistic enough. They don't go to the bottom of the truth. We are in no position to reform the Axis because we have the same disease in us. Beware of British and American Imperialism; it is as deadly (and probably the cause of this war) as any Axis imperialism! THINK ON THESE THINGS."



# The World Church: News and Notes

## Karl Barth on Forgiveness

In a booklet called *Promise and Responsibility of the Christian Church Today*, Professor Karl Barth attempts to define the tasks confronting the church at the end of the war, especially as regards the German people. We reproduce the following passages:

"Amid present-day happenings, it is the responsibility of the Christian Church to see to it that the Word in which the deepest truth of the Kingdom of God and of Our Lord Jesus Christ is set forth should not be suppressed, but should be clearly stated. That Word is the Forgiveness of Sins. . . .

"It is true that very many grievous sins have been committed before God and before men in these days. We shall clearly perceive their extent only on the day when there will be an explosion of vengeance. Restitution and severe punishment will inevitably accompany the restoration of order. It is quite right, too, that Christians should not talk too quickly and too glibly about the common and equal guilt of all, but it should be recognized that there are real distinctions in the realm of responsibilities and their inevitable consequences, and these distinctions cannot be blotted out simply by a general pardoning and forgiving. But all this must not prevent the Christian Church from believing and professing that He who governs the world is the gracious God: the God who forgives sins.

"This belief and this profession have nothing in common with insincere sentimentality with regard to wickedness and wicked people. To be sure, there has seldom been a nation which has so definitely placed itself in the wrong towards all others and proclaimed their own verdict as the German people have done in these last years. But it is precisely this obvious character of this situation which must cause us Christians to reflect. For it is precisely in their struggle against God that the German people have also placed themselves in the wrong on the human plane, and have failed so terribly. And it is precisely in their impotence before Him that they have to suffer, and will have to suffer still more. These people must now have the bitter experience that the God who forgives sins does not allow Himself to be mocked, and that human insolence is not able to shake the throne of mercy. They must learn that this is the meaning of their present experience: to meet the gracious God whom they wished to reject, but who does not allow Himself to be rejected."

## An Army Theological Seminary

Writing to the Bureau of Men in Service of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Chaplain Bert Helm reports one of the most interesting developments of a chaplain's work which has come to our attention. Chaplain Helm has gathered thirty pre-theological students in his unit and also university teachers and theologically trained men and thus assembled a little theological seminary, designed to help men prepare for their post-war vocation. Chaplain Helm writes that other chaplains who may be in spots where "they could comb together pre-theological students and competent scholar-

ship" might find the idea worth repeating. It is a splendid idea which we would like to pass on to the thousand chaplains on our subscription list.

## French Catholic Authorities Seek Marriage Control

Roman Catholic authorities here have instructed priests that applications by French women to marry members of the Allied forces must be submitted to the archdiocesan office before marriage ceremonies are performed.

*Le Semaine Religieuse*, official Catholic publication, stated that the ecclesiastical court has been informed that "the military authorities view with regret their soldiers marrying in continental countries."

"On our side we cannot forget that many hastily contracted marriages in 1918 and 1919 between Frenchwomen and soldiers of Allied armies had an unhappy fate. This is why we ask priests to explain, when possible, to future couples and parents the numerous inconveniences such marriages entail.

"The British government is presently preparing a law annulling marriages contracted by soldiers outside the country. It is possible that other states will take similar measures. Thus, each time a marriage is proposed to a British or American subject, priests will kindly submit the case to the marriage bureau of the archbishopric." (RNS)

## Text of Russian Orthodox Message to Christians of the World

"Brother Christians the world over! You are addressed by the general council (sobor) of the Russian Orthodox Church which is assembled in Moscow, our historical capital, hallowed by the spirit of our historical sanctities and strengthened by the exploits of great Russian churchmen and statesmen, to elect a Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, the successor of the late Most Holy Patriarch Sergei.

"Brothers and sisters in God! The present general council of the Russian Orthodox Church has gathered at a time when our country has been liberated from the enemy by the exploits of our valorous army, but throughout the world the war is not yet over. There will still be heavy battles and sanguinary struggles, but the outcome of the war has been resolved and nobody and nothing can change it. Now it is evident to all on earth whose arms have been blessed by our Lord Jesus Christ and those whose arms have not received such blessing; to those whose prayers reached the Lord as did Abel's sacrifice, and to those whose sacrilegious invocations darken the earth as smoke out of the fire of fratricidal Cain.

"Our valiant Red Army is bringing, yea has already brought, liberation from ruthless enslavers to many peoples near to us. German troops have been expelled from nearly all countries they captured and the territory of Germany itself has now become a battlefield. Former dreams of world domination by the "master race" have become a thing of the shameful past.

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Editorial Assistant*

"Peace, craved by a martyred humanity, plunged by Germany—not for the first time—into the conflagration of war, would be unstable and not of long duration. Yet, nevertheless, voices from time to time are raised urging in the name of forgiveness that infanticides and traitors be pardoned! And this comes from people who dare call themselves Christians. These people, by communicating themselves unto other people's sins, expose themselves, to cite the apostle, to the same condemnation that is the lot of the Fascists, now wallowing in the blood of their victims." (RNS)

The disquieting aspect of this message of the newly emancipated Russian Church is that it does not rise at any point beyond nationalistic perspectives and seems in the final paragraph to challenge both the Catholic and Protestant statements on the Christian attitude toward a fallen enemy.

## British Religious Leaders Deplore 'Ruthlessness' of War

Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders have issued an appeal here "to all Christians" against continued acceptance of the "ever-increasing ruthlessness" of the war. Referring particularly to Allied obliteration bombing, the statement declared that "a gesture of compassion and mercy" might help to break down the feeling among Germans that they must fight to the last, and thus spare the lives of many thousands of soldiers and civilians on both sides.

The statement was signed unofficially by the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham, the Rt. Rev. Ernest W. Barnes; Count Michael de la Bedoyere, editor of the Catholic Herald; the Rev. Henry Carter, C. B. E. (Methodist); Dr. A. D. Belden (Congregationalist); and a number of clergymen of the Unitarian, Baptist Presbyterian and Quaker denominations.

"While we are all revolted by the crime of our enemies, we are also dismayed by the appalling results of the bombing of whole cities and towns by the United

Nations. It is grievous that those responsible for this policy should be the peoples that profess the highest humanitarian and even Christian principles.

"The dropping of a thousand tons of high explosives and half a million incendiary bombs on one city in a single attack destroys all possibility of discrimination, while the press now openly speaks of Allied terror bombing. The arrival of the pilotless plane and the development of rocket bombing are pointers to the still deeper moral abyss, on the brink of which civilization stands.

"Might not a gesture of compassion and mercy help to break down the fear in German hearts that unless they fight to the last, there is no hope for the future? This is a better way to avoid the needless prolongation of the war than the ever-increasing ruthlessness which is a surrender to our real enemy, the Nazi spirit. The lives of many thousands of soldiers and civilians on both sides could thus be spared." (RNS)

## V-Bomb Kills British Church Officials

The Rev. William T. Elmslie, general secretary of the Presbyterian Church in England, and secretary of the British Council of Churches' Committee on Reconstruction of Christian Institutions in Europe, was among those killed when a V-bomb damaged a church hall in Southern England.

Other Presbyterian officials killed were W. H. Wright, financial secretary; the Rev. T. W. Douglas, foreign missions secretary; and W. T. Stubbs, assistant general secretary, and others. (RNS)

## Vatican-Soviet Negotiations Rumored in Rome

Recent Soviet attacks on the Holy See and the vigorous reply by the Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano* appear to seasoned observers to resemble the irritations that frequently precede diplomatic bargaining and compromises.

Persistent rumors that negotiations are under way to explore the possibilities of an arrangement between Marshall Stalin and the Pope support this interpretation. Soviet outbursts against the Pope are seen as an attempt to put the Vatican on the defensive and thus get the best possible terms during preparatory negotiations.

The current situation, Rome observers feel, presents an urgent need for some kind of agreement between the Vatican and the Soviet Government. The Russian military occupation of large Catholic territories obliges the Soviet regime to define its attitude toward Catholicism. The Russian government must either adopt a policy of control or repression of religious activity, or extend religious freedom in the territories she hopes permanently to annex to the rest of the Soviet Union. If, as Russian officials assert, the policy is to be one of freedom, it is argued, an agreement with the Vatican is inevitable. (RNS)

## Author in this Issue

Galen M. Fisher, as one of the founders and the Secretary of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play on the Pacific Coast, has been at the center of all the efforts to secure just treatment of Japanese-Americans.

Periodical Division

Detroit Public Library

5201 Woodward Ave.

Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-46